1		Judge Thomas S. Zilly	
2		F11 6.	
3		TILED LODGED RECEIVED	
4		JUL 29 2004	
5			
6		CLERK AT SEATILE WESTERN DISTRICT COURT BY WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON DEPUTY	
7 8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
10	Plaintiff,	NO. CR04-163Z	
11	v.	PLEA AGREEMENT	
12	JAMES ROBERT MURPHY,		
13	Defendant.		
14			
15	The United States of America, by and through John McKay, United States Attorney		
16	for the Western District of Washington, and Kathryn A. Warma, Assistant United States		
17	Attorney for said District, and the defendant, JAN	MES ROBERT MURPHY, and his	
18	attorney, Omodare Jupiter, enter into the following Agreement, pursuant to Federal Rule		
19	of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(C):		
20			
21	1. <u>The Charge</u> . Defendant, having been	en advised of the right to have this matter	
22	tried before a jury, agrees to waive that right and enter a plea of guilty to the following		
23	charges contained in the Indictment. By entering this plea of guilty, Defendant hereby		
24	waives all objections to the form of the charging document.		
25	a. Use of a Telecommunication	s Device in Interstate Communications	
26	with Intent to Annoy, Abuse, Threaten or Harass	, as charged in Counts 13 and 15, in	

violation of Title 47, United States Code, Section 223(a)(1)(C).

1	g. The right to testify or to remain silent at trial, at which trial such	
2	silence could not be used against Defendant;	
3	h. The right to appeal a finding of guilt or any pretrial rulings; and	
4	i. The right, to the extent required by law, to have sentencing factors	
5	charged in the Indictment or determined by a jury beyond a	
6	reasonable doubt.	
7		
8	5. <u>United States Sentencing Guidelines</u> . Defendant understands and	
9	acknowledges that, absent applicable intervening law:	
10	a. The United States Sentencing Guidelines, promulgated by the	
11	United States Sentencing Commission, are applicable to this case;	
12	b. The Court will determine Defendant's applicable Sentencing	
13	Guidelines range at the time of sentencing;	
14	c. Except as provided in paragraph 8 below, <u>Sentencing</u> , Defendant may	
15	not withdraw a guilty plea solely because of the sentence imposed by the Court.	
16		
17	6. <u>Ultimate Sentence</u> . Defendant acknowledges that no one has promised or	
18	guaranteed what sentence the Court will impose.	
19		
20	7. <u>Statement of Facts</u> . The parties agree on the following facts in support of	
21	Defendant's guilty plea and sentencing. Defendant admits he is guilty of the charged	
22	offenses and expressly waives any right to have these facts determined by a jury beyond a	
23	reasonable doubt.	
24	a. JAMES ROBERT MURPHY had a sporadic romantic relationship	
25	with a woman named Joelle Ligon, during the period from 1984 through 1990.	
26	b. By 2002, Ligon had taken up residence in the State of Washington,	
27	and secured employment with the City of Seattle, as a Public Relations Specialist with the	
28	Seattle Parks Department. By no later than May of 2002, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY	

- successfully obtained her e-mail address at her place of employment. By no later than
 May 30, 2002, MURPHY began transmitting uninvited and harassing e-mail messages to
 Ligon, addressing them to her workplace computer at the City of Seattle Parks
 Department. MURPHY initiated the harassing e-mail communications from his computer
- in South Carolina, and transmitted them through interstate communications via the Internet, to Ligon's workplace computer in Seattle, Washington.
 - c. During the period from May 30, 2002, through and until April 10, 2003, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY used his computer in South Carolina to initiate and transmit through interstate communications via the Internet dozens of e-mail, and also facsimile ("fax") messages, to Ligon and to other employees of the City of Seattle, without disclosing his identity, and with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass Joelle Ligon. Although Ligon initially deleted the communications that she received from MURPHY upon receipt, she ultimately began to save and copy, and thereby preserve the messages. Copies of 26 communications transmitted electronically and through interstate communications by JAMES ROBERT MURPHY to Ligon and, in some cases, to other Seattle City employees, are attached as Exhibits 1 26.
 - d. JAMES ROBERT MURPHY acted affirmatively and intentionally to disguise his identity as the originator and sender of all of the 26 communications appended as Exhibits 1 26 in at least two different ways. One technique used by MURPHY was to insert a false name as ("spoof") the identity of the purported "sender" of the communication. For example, MURPHY acted to make one of the messages appear to have been sent by "Bishop Sanders," from "bsanders@seattlecatholic.org" (Exhibit 22). A second technique MURPHY used to disguise his identity as the originator and sender of the subject messages was to utilize Internet "anonymizing" services that MURPHY believed would relay or forward his communications while eliminating or "stripping" information identifying the originating computer. JAMES ROBERT MURPHY sought and intended by these means to avoid identification as the person who had used a

- e. JAMES ROBERT MURPHY also acted affirmatively and intentionally to craft misleading "subject" descriptions for many of the annoying, abusive, threatening or harassing communications; titling messages, for example, with "subjects" such as "raw sewage in Denny Park," "park sanitation," or "important information about ice rink," which would indicate the message related to a Seattle Parks Department issue, when in fact, the communications had no relationship to Seattle Parks Department issues, but were instead intended only to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass the recipient of the messages (Exhibits 5, 6, 20). MURPHY "titled" another message, "Analisa wanted you to see this," with the knowledge that "Analisa" was the name of Joelle Ligon's sister, and with the intention that use of Ligon's sister's name in the "subject" title would entice Ligon to open and read the communication that MURPHY had transmitted with the intention to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass Ligon, as the recipient (Exhibit 13).
- f. Included among the dozens of electronic communications JAMES ROBERT MURPHY transmitted, from his computer in South Carolina through interstate communications via the Internet, to Seattle, Washington, without disclosing his identity and with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass, were the following:
- 1) On or about August 28, 2002, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY, who was then present in South Carolina, used a computer and the Internet to send an e-mail message to Joelle Ligon, which message was received by her on a computer at the place of her employment in Seattle, Washington; which message was purportedly sent to Ligon by a "sender" falsely identified by MURPHY as "Adam Mada"; which message had as its stated subject, "Analisa wanted you to see this"; and which message was intended by JAMES ROBERT MURPHY to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass the person who received the communication. (Exhibit 13).
- 2) On or about September 13, 2002, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY, who was then present in South Carolina, used a computer and the Internet to send an e-

- mail message to Joelle Ligon, as well as to ten other individuals employed by the City of Seattle, which message was received by Ligon and others on computers at the place of 2 their employment in Seattle, Washington; which message was purportedly sent by a 3 "sender" falsely identified by MURPHY as "James Maidson"; which message had as its 4 stated subject, "Concerning your employee Joelle Ligon"; and which message was intended by JAMES ROBERT MURPHY to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass the person/s who received the communication. (Exhibit 15).
 - g. Joelle Ligon did not invite or welcome any of the dozens of electronic communications JAMES ROBERT MURPHY transmitted to her and to other employees of the City of Seattle. Although Joelle Ligon suspected that JAMES ROBERT MURPHY was responsible, the identity of the sender/s was disguised. Joelle Ligon could, therefore, testify that she did not know if any one individual, or even a group of individuals, was targeting her. The communications transmitted by JAMES ROBERT MURPHY to Joelle Ligon at her workplace in the City of Seattle had the effect of annoying, abusing, threatening and/or harassing her. The effect upon Joelle Ligon was to instill within her fear for her personal safety, and fear of the consequences on her continued or future employment.
 - h. After having received dozens of annoying, abusive, threatening and harassing email communications over a period of almost one year, Joelle Ligon applied to the Superior Court of Washington for King County for a Protection Order in April of 2003, seeking to restrain JAMES ROBERT MURPHY from making "any attempts to contact" her. On May 12, 2003, a detective with the Hanahan, South Carolina Police Department served the Petition for Protection Order and Temporary Order for Protection and Notice of Hearing on JAMES ROBERT MURPHY, at his residence in Hanahan, South Carolina. (Exhibit 27). After he was served with the Petition and Temporary Order for Protection on May 12, 2003, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY immediately violated the terms of the Temporary Order for Protection by sending an e-mail communication to Joelle Ligon, addressed to her workplace e-mail, in which he stated (falsely) that he had not sent

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- i. On May 14, 2003, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY, without counsel, faxed a letter to the Clerk of the Court, King County Superior Court, in which he also (falsely) denied that he had sent harassing communications to Joelle Ligon, and that "Ms. Ligon's assertions that [he was] somehow behind the harassment she alleges to have experienced are baseless and absurd." (Exhibit 29).
- j. On April 9, 2004, JAMES ROBERT MURPHY was arrested by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. After advisement of his Miranda rights, MURPHY agreed to waive those rights, and admitted that he had used a computer to send dozens of e-mail or fax messages to Ligon in Seattle, Washington.
- k. JAMES ROBERT MURPHY did use a telecommunications device, namely, his personal computer in South Carolina, to transmit through interstate communications via the Internet, to Seattle, Washington, communications to persons without disclosing his identity and with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass the recipient thereof, on each of the 26 occasions specified in Counts 1 26 of the Indictment in Case No. CR04-163Z.

8. Sentencing. Pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(C) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the parties acknowledge and agree that the appropriate sentence to be imposed by the Court at the time of sentencing is a term of probation within the range of from thirty-six (36) to sixty (60) months. If the sentencing court does not adopt the agreement of the parties and imposes a sentence outside the agreed upon range, both the defendant and the United States reserve the right to withdraw from this agreement pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(C) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and to proceed to trial. No other agreement has been made with regard to the imposition of the sentence in

this matter, and the parties understand that the Court retains full discretion to impose a sentence within the range agreed to above.

9. Restitution. Defendant shall make restitution to the victims and in the amount ordered by the Court after hearing arguments. Said amount shall be due and payable immediately and shall be paid in accordance with a schedule of payments as set by the United States Probation Office and ordered by the Court.

10. Non-Prosecution of Additional Offenses. As part of this Plea Agreement, the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington agrees further, not to prosecute Defendant for any additional offenses known to it as of the time of this Agreement that are based upon evidence in its possession at this time, or that arise out of the conduct giving rise to this investigation. In this regard, Defendant recognizes that the United States has agreed not to prosecute all of the criminal charges that the evidence establishes were committed by Defendant solely because of the promises made by Defendant in this Agreement. Defendant acknowledges and agrees, however, that for purposes of preparing the Presentence Report, the United States Attorney's Office will provide the United States Probation Office with evidence of all relevant conduct committed by Defendant.

Pursuant to this Plea Agreement, and conditioned on Defendant's fulfillment of all of its conditions, the United States agrees to move the Court, at the time of sentencing, to dismiss without prejudice as to Defendant Counts 1-12, 14, 16-26 of the Indictment in No. CR04-163Z. Defendant agrees that, if the conviction is later dismissed or vacated, the dismissed counts of the Indictment in No. CR04-163Z may be reinstated.

Defendant agrees and acknowledges that any charges to be dismissed before or at the time of sentencing were substantially justified in light of the evidence available to the United States, were not vexatious, frivolous or taken in bad faith, and do not provide

1 ||Defendant with a basis for any future claims under the "Hyde Amendment," Pub.L. No. 105-119 (1997).

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

2

11. Acceptance of Responsibility. The United States acknowledges that Defendant has assisted the United States by timely notifying the authorities of his intention to plead guilty, thereby permitting the United Sates to avoid preparing for trial and permitting the Court to allocate its resources efficiently. If at the time of sentencing, the United States remains satisfied that Defendant has accepted responsibility, then it will recommend a sentence that takes this acceptance of responsibility into consideration. Defendant understands and agrees that the United States will base it recommendation on factors set forth in the United States Sentencing Guidelines, including Section 3E1.1.

12

13

14

15

16

11

12. Voluntariness of Plea. Defendant acknowledges that he has entered into this Plea Agreement freely and voluntarily, and that no threats or promises, other than the promises contained in this Plea Agreement, were made to induce Defendant to enter this plea of guilty.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

13. Statute of Limitations. In the event that this Agreement is not accepted by the Court for any reason, or Defendant has breached any of the terms of this Plea Agreement, the statute of limitations shall be deemed to have been tolled from the date of the Plea Agreement to: (1) 30 days following the date of non-acceptance of the Plea Agreement by the Court; or (2) 30 days following the date on which a breach of the Plea Agreement by Defendant is discovered by the United States Attorney's Office.

24

25

26

27

14. Post-Plea Conduct. Defendant understands that the terms of this Plea Agreement apply only to conduct that occurred prior to the execution of this Agreement. If, after the date of this Agreement, Defendant should engage in conduct that would warrant an increase in Defendant's adjusted offense level or justify an upward departure

1	under the Sentencing Guidelines (examples of which include, but are not limited to:
2	obstruction of justice, failure to appear for a court proceeding, criminal conduct while
3	pending sentencing, and false statements to law enforcement agents, the probation officer
4	or Court), the United States is free under this Agreement to seek a sentencing
5	enhancement or upward departure based on that conduct.
6	
7	15. Completeness of Agreement. The United States and Defendant
8	acknowledge that these terms constitute the entire Plea Agreement between the parties.
9	This Agreement only binds the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of
10	Washington. It does not bind any other United States Attorney's Office or any other office
11	or agency of the United States, or any state or local prosecutor.
12	
13	
14	DATED: This $\frac{29}{}$ day of $\frac{1}{}$
15	
16	
17	JAMES ROBERT MURPHY Defendant
18	
19	Augolan hugel
20	OMODARÉ JUPITER Attorney for Defendant
21	
22	
23	KATHRYN A. WARMA Assistant United States Attorney
24	1111000
25	HAY DUNG
26	FLOYD 6. SHORT Assistant United States Attorney
27	
28	